REMARKS

I.   STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 2 and 8 are cancelled.

New claim 15 is added. Support for the claim is found, for example, in paragraph [0024], of the application.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-7 and 9-15 are currently pending.

II.   REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 7, 8, 13 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY MAEDA ET AL. (U.S. PUBLICATION NO. 2006/0004780)

Claim 1 is amended herein to incorporate the features of dependent claim 2, reciting a unit for identifying special character strings on the basis of the analysis results via preset values of the typographic information, the unit for identifying special character strings determining that a certain character string is special on the basis of the typographic information of the formatted document when the typographic information of the character string is determined to be special typographic information. Claim 7 is similarly amended to incorporate the features of dependent claim 8. The Applicant respectfully submits that Maeda fails to disclose these features.

Maeda discusses "a scheme for constructing a database for a user system which handles structured documents such as WWW (World Wide Web) documents and e-mails, by automatically storing information extracted from the structured documents." Paragraph [0001], of Maeda. An "item extraction device 110 reads out the important item extraction method set by the user", which may include "using names of the tags of the structured document." See paragraphs [0153] and [0154], of Maeda. For instance, in the Maeda specification, "the extraction tag <meeting> and its lower layer structure 1201 are extracted as the important items." Paragraph [0154], of Maeda. The document is also searched for synonyms of important items. See paragraph [0155], of Maeda.

The Office Action states on page 4 that "Maeda discloses a synonym database of extraction name tags, which is used to search for the extracted tag name." The Applicant believes the Examiner is equating "extraction name tags" as discussed in Maeda with "typographic information" as recited in claim 1. As recited in claim 1, preset values of typographic information are used to identify **special character strings**. As a nonlimiting example, in some embodiments, for instance, the typographic information could be font size and

special typographic information could be that the largest font size found in a document. See, for example, paragraphs [0019] and [0020], of the application.

However, per the above, Maeda discusses extracting a tag and its lower layer structure if the tag is determined to be an important item. For example, as can be seen in paragraphs [0154], [0155] and Fig. 12A of Maeda, if important item "<meeting>" is found, lower layer structure "<date>" and "<place>" are also extracted. As such, there is no determination that a character string is special based on typographic information, the typographic information being different from the character string itself. Maeda merely searches for important item tags and their synonyms, extracting the lower layer structure if an important item is found.

The above comments are specifically directed to claim 1. However, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding various differences of various other claims over the cited reference.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. **REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3-6 AND 9-12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER MAEDA IN VIEW OF OKAMOTO (U.S. PUBLICATION NO. 2002/0065814)**

Claims 3-6 and 9-12 depend from claims 1 and 7 and add further features thereto. Nothing is cited or found in Okamoto that overcomes the deficiencies of Maeda discussed above with respect to claim 1. Thus, claims 3-6 and 9-12 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. **NEW CLAIM**

New claim 15 is added herein. Claim 15 recites that the special typographic information is the font type and the character string is determined to be special typographic information if the font type differs from the surrounding character strings. Nothing is found in the cited art that teaches this feature. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 also distinguishes over the cited art.

V. **CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: *11-13-2007*   By: *Michael A. Leonard II*

Michael A. Leonard II
Registration No. 60,180

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501